2006 Office of Grants and Training National Conference
November 28 – 30th, 2006

Trip Report - Rich Tokarzewski
FFY 07 grant guidance was not released on November 17th. As a result, much of the anticipated conference materials and sessions were disappointing. See Session Overviews and Notes below.

1st Day Offerings Attended	2nd Day Offerings Attended
Implementing the NIMS	Port/Mass Transit Technical Assistance
Implementing the NIPP	Homeland Security Grants
Medical Surge Capacity	

3rd Day Offering Attended
Investment Justifications

Keynote Speaker DHS Secretary Michael Chertoff
The most important points made by Secretary Chertoff centered on the FFY 07 grant processes. He described a two phase application process. Phase one submissions would be reviewed (he did not specify by whom) with comments being returned to applicants for revision and or clarification. This new information did not/could not consider how the comments would be handled at the intra state level. The intention is to do less bean counting, less complex, risk evaluations and more focus on risk principles. This cycle of grant guidelines will include the scoring criteria and their relative weighting for scores, there will be increased emphasis on performance measures, interoperable communications (score cards from the recent exercises will be made available), commodity/logistics management, a digital warning system within 2 years, and support of citizen preparedness through Citizen Corps and the 'Ready' campaign.

Implementing NIMS – Jim Mulliken and Kyle Blackum, DHS
Jim and Kyle covered the year by year NIMS requirements from IS 700 and 800 competency thru ICS 100-200-300-400 training, resource typing, and credentialing.

FFY 07 is being billed as a 'catch up' year. This policy is designed to allow those jurisdictions struggling with ICS training to complete that mission before embarking on the logistics and credentialing requirements. The speakers spent time describing the origin of the 120 categories specified and the Maryland 70 (categories) that have gained wide acceptance. The 'Maryland 70' are additional categories of resources that have been outlined with kind and type designations. Forwarded by the State of Maryland, these are not federal requirements. The Maryland 70 includes items like one ton trucks – items that are readily ordered using common language.

Job aides for logistics are being produced that will support field management of resources.

FIPS 201 badges have been issued to people hoping to gain access to federal sites during emergencies. The badges have a limit to the data they can confirm (who you are and an 'order number'). Many people have asked if additional information can be included in the badge like: training, specialties, security levels, and other credential specific items.

MACC guidance is to be delivered shortly on the formation and operation of the Multi-Agency Coordination Center.

NIPP National Infrastructure Protection Plan
Councils have been set up to review the National Infrastructure Protection Plan. The speakers acknowledged that 85% of all infrastructures are owned by the private sector. Issues to the private sector are: security from potential hazards, protecting information that may be used by the competition or hurt shareholder values, exemption from Freedom of Information Act requests and Sunshine laws. Infrastructure has been categorized into 17 sectors. PCII will handle credentials required to access information on infrastructure as it is compiled.
Private Sector infrastructure owners are also interest in receiving intelligence reports when they are related to their sector or when threats are specifically directed. Presentation by the Arizona State Police described the work they are doing with fusion centers to generate threat/risk/vulnerability thresholds that would generate response call outs while limiting public/media access to secure information. Project Arch Angel was described by a Los Angeles Police Captain. Focus is on prevention and deterrence. There are related initiatives: identification of assets, critical asset vulnerability, and automatic evaluation of risk.

Ports and Transit Grants
US Coast Guard – Nicole Rodriguez – MAST program generates a gap analysis. It is currently being tested with the Port of Baltimore to generate strategic ways to reduce risk with grant support. The program's focus is on return on investment. When MAST representatives are in your region, you can request a print out of your local critical facilities.

Port of Long Beach – The POLB representative described their priorities.
Container Inspection Center to be centered within port property
Perimeter security on roadways and along shoreline from un-identified recreational boaters
Monitoring access bridges and canals
Effective evacuation modeling – learning from the daily commute
Communications – operability first, interoperability second

Transit described its needs as:
Reliance on outside assets for response and inter jurisdictional planning
Problems with jurisdictional authority, integrating those plans
Cost benefit – considering projects with life cycles of 10 years and greater
Problems with consequence management being outside eligibility guidelines
Trying to apply equipment and system purchases (with grant money) to span prevention, response and recovery efforts
Notation that the application process blocks strategic development that integrates US Coast Guard since USCG is on the review panel and is not allowed to benefit from these grants

Some technical support to transit may be available in addition to grant resources. Currently, these grants have a 25% match. The applicant agency would be responsible for this match even if the beneficiary is a private sector organization, multiple agencies, or federal agencies. Some have used local agreements to provide soft matches as their contribution. Technical support is available to all agencies even if they are not grant recipients.

Grant Guidance FFY 07
In the FFY 06 after action review of the grant peer evaluation process, 32 separate changes were offered. Of these changes, 28 have been acted on by DHS. A few of these were identified in the presentation.

- Reduction of application paperwork – 50% less paperwork. Much of the reference materials will be available on line
- All items that have been amended will be highlighted with a NEW! Symbol to draw your attention
- The Performance Period for FFY 07 will be 36 months. There is no intention to grant an automatic 12 month extension to the FFY 05 and FFY 06 grants to match this new performance period
- Language in the grant guidance will be updated to common language from 'analyst speak'
- Fusion center projects will receive priority for LETPP grants
- Planning costs may be incorporated into program evaluation expenses
- FFY 07 will focus on tangible activities (did not specify what that meant)
- Improvements recommended in the National Plans Review would be very favorably scored
- Building a sustainable Critical Infrastructure Protection program
- Intelligence and Fusion Center projects will be favorably scored
- Interoperability Communications Exercise Scorecards will be available to generate improvement proposals in the FFY 07 grant cycle
- Implementing 'secure the cities' pilot program

Medical Surge Capacity
The presentation was a description of what medical surge capacity is. Medical surge was described having three parts: experience, problem identification, and a list of solutions. Players with a stake in planning and preparing of surge capacity rests with: academic institutions like schools and public hospitals, poison control centers, and response agencies like EMS, law enforcement, medical communities, and hospital associations.

Surge capacity plans cited have 12 point plans including: leadership, planning, communications, protective equipment, decontamination, surge capability, security, clinical management, staffing levels, management of fatalities, and training

Surge capacity works within a stratified care system
Communications/Public Education
In Homecare, Peer to Peer care, Community health care, National healthcare

<u>Care delivery</u>
Hospital care facilities
Main street triage
Home care

<u>Tom Ahren – California Public Health</u>
Noted the use in California of a software package used for flu surge that identified gaps in capacity for moderate and catastrophic flu outbreaks
Mr. Ahren recommended considering cross border impacts, shortfalls in ventilators, meds, personnel and beds available
The largest identified gap exists in hospitals themselves. They tend to have evacuation plans but not surge plans. Predictive scenarios are needed to build effective surge capacity.

<u>Standards and Guidelines</u>
Standards are being developed for licensed and non-licensed healthcare professionals. Development of mobile hospitals, distribution systems for ventilator, policy for masks and other resources, and decision points is needed for effective plans.

<u>Center for Disease Control</u>
CDC identified credentialing as a key issue as well as training and advanced preparations for pandemics and other medical emergencies.

They described a straightforward approach involving targeting capabilities for surge volunteers and prophylaxis
Models for Medical Corps assistance:
Establish their mission, roles and keys for success
Use tiered levels of training and assignment of personnel
Direct involvement of a sponsoring agency
Identification of partners in planning and training
Development of a response organization structure
Verification system must be in place for credentials
Establish a regimen of training and practice

All surge capability falls in to four categories
Data, stuff, staff, and space

Investment Justification Session
Much of the same information covered by Secretary Chertoff was covered again in this session. The guidance for FFY 07 is expected to be released sometime in December. The Investment justification forms will have the same look and feel, improved functionality, and flexibility. It will still be an Excel based form with the ability to generate an MS Word version for local distribution. The new format will allow insertion of graphics and illustrations, narrative for budget statements, and the changes to the narrative size limits within each section. There will be provision for multiple state/UASI area collaborative proposals. These will be reviewed by a separate panel. A 5% bonus score will be awarded to good multi-state proposal scores.

Enhancement plans may require changes or updates. Recertification of validity may be substituted were applicable. Grant Guidance will be released via an Information Bulletin.

The 15% cap on personnel expenditures will be lifted for MMRS and Citizen Corps only.

UASI Investment Justifications will be reviewed in a three tiered grouping. Each state will make its IJ submissions on line. Project management will be part of the FFY 07 user manual. Several states were interested in the inclusion of funding for work against 'school invasions'. DHS said this was unlikely.